

M. W. KYRCHANOFF

**INTELLECTUAL ARCHAEOLOGIES OF MEDIEVALISM
IDENTITY AND HISTORICAL MEMORY
IN LATVIAN MEDIEVAL STUDIES IN SOVIET PERIOD
(the case of Vasīlii Doroshenko)**

Автор анализирует проблемы интеллектуальной археологии текстов советского медиевиста Василия Дорошенко, который начинал академическую карьеру в Московском университете. Политическая динамика советского общества во второй половине 1940-х гг. вынудила его стать участником антисемитской кампании и критиковать своего научного руководителя А.И. Неусыхина. Спустя несколько лет, не сумев интегрироваться в сообщество московских медиевистов, Дорошенко переехал в Латвийскую ССР, где стал одним из ведущих историков-медиевистов. Культура цитирования была уникальным явлением в советской историографии. Автор пытается проанализировать почему В. Дорошенко цитировал одних и игнорировал других советских историков. Автор полагает, что культуры цитирования в контексте интеллектуальной археологии можно воспринимать как формы символических коммуникаций и обмена дарами между советскими медиевистами. Культуры цитирования можно также воспринимать как изобретенные традиции.

Ключевые слова: история медиевистики, В.В. Дорошенко, латышская историография, интеллектуальная археология, цитирование, обмен дарами

The contemporary intellectual situation actualizes the gradual erosion of traditional collective representations about historiography as the history of historical science and knowledge, which dominated and prevailed in the earlier, mostly positivist, historiographies. Postmodern cultural situation awakes other earlier ignored forms and dimensions of historiography. Actual situation forces historiography to change and fragment, split into more specific and highly specialised forms of historical knowledge. Lorina Repina presumes that "historiography should not be the history of historians, but the history of historical science" and historians should try to understand the "dialectic interaction of social development and history of ideas"¹. An analysis of the origins and emergence of historical knowledge in this context is especially important. Aron Gurevich in 1997 presumed that the collective beliefs that "if there is no sense of crisis, if everything goes according to old paths if historians use tested and proven techniques, it is possible to speak about the crisis in history. This crisis expresses in facts that historians are not looking for new content... and it inevitably leads to a repetition of the past"². These crisis trends are prevalent in modern normativist historiography because its representatives prefer to collect facts, arrange and systemize them in chronological order.

¹ Repina, 2003, 9–18.

² Gurevich, 1997, 233–250.

Historiography. Separate and non-systemized attempts to commit individual experience³ are very informative, but they actualize mostly personal participations and impacts of the authors, their own understandings of the history of Soviet medieval studies, their roles and places in Soviet historiography. Aron Gurevich in 2002 declared necessity to study personal experience of historians⁴, their approaches to selection of facts, relations with censorship and self-censorship. Russian historians in the 2000s–2010s published several works focused on the relations between intellectuals and power⁵, history of Soviet medieval studies and its regional centres⁶. Almost total absence of texts about intellectual archaeology or a history of ideas, cultural and intellectual history of Soviet medievalism and its scholars is significant of contemporary Russian medieval studies. Some of recently published works have mainly methodological character and actualize the general theoretical problems of history, including Medieval Studies. Neither Pavel Uvarov nor Nikolai Koposov does not analyse intellectual archaeological dimensions of collective representations about genesis of Medievalism, preferring to solve methodologically more significant general tasks⁷. The forced ignorance of this problem significantly slows rethinking and systematisation of historiographical experience and formation of new tactics and strategies for development of Russian academic community of medievalists.

Fall and career of the Soviet medievalist. Problems of academic analysis of medievalists' individual and personalised histories belong to the number of complex problems because only few medievalists provided modern historians with memoirs⁸ that actualize the various parts and dimensions of adaptation and mimicry of Soviet historians in an undemocratic society. The facts of memory capture and fix different dimensions of identity and collective representations about the past. The memoirs and other thematically related texts as forms of culture of memory simultaneously suppress and actualize various individual and collective representations about the author's place in the community⁹, he formally belongs to. Therefore, the studies of certain processes determined by Dmitrii Haritonovich as “the genesis of medievalist”¹⁰ belong to complex and highly prospective problems. Personal and private aspects of the intellectual experience of medievalists belong to formally closed pages of the history of Soviet medievalism. These texts form the corpus of sources that can provide modern historians with some ideas

³ Gurevich 2004; Gutnova 2001; Svanidze 2002; Stam 2009.

⁴ Gurevich 2002.

⁵ Dubrovskii 2005; Sveshnikov 2008; Vol'f'sun 1999; Iurganov 2011.

⁶ Galiamichev 2002, 2003, 2010; Lebedeva, Iakubskii 2007.

⁷ Uvarov 2006; Koposov 2001.

⁸ Vasil'ev 2008.

⁹ Balodis 2007; Rubene 2014.

¹⁰ Haritonovich, 2000.

about the intellectual archaeology of ideas in Soviet medievalism. The author intends to analyse the texts of Vasilii Doroshenko, who became one of the leading Latvian historians and medievalists of the Soviet period.

P. Uvarov presumes that Soviet historian was always ready to repulse “bourgeois falsifiers”, but they argued not less fiercely with their countrymen¹¹. The situation from the cultural point of view can be defined in terms of lack of freedom, including the lack of freedom of the mind¹², dependency from authoritarian political ideologies and formal constraints of the Soviet era. The figure of Doroshenko is interesting because of memoirs of two leaders of Soviet medievalists, including Aron Gurevich and Evgeniya Gutnova, despite their diametrically opposed ideological and political preferences fixed contradictory role of Doroshenko in the same negative contexts. Published memoirs actualize new dimensions in a history of Soviet Medieval studies and transformed them into one of the forms of memory histories.

Doroshenko was among critics of Aleksandr Neusykhin. Gurevich in his memoirs “Istoriia istorika” (“History of the historian”), commenting the place of Doroshenko in the history of Soviet medieval studies, stressed:

“he was undoubtedly talented and likeable man. Why did he betray his favourite teacher? It seems, that the answer is simple. He defended his thesis, and he was told: if you do it, we will charge You, You will receive a place in the department and he got a place, but a year later, he had to leave it. He was let go, or he could not stand it, but I knew that, unlike others, who delivered easy, Vasilii Doroshenko suffered from a serious injury that imprinted throughout his later life. This fall completely broke him. When Neusykhin died, he came from Riga, where he was working, but he did not dare to come to the funeral”.

Gurevich described the role of Doroshenko in the following way: “the speech of Vasilii Doroshenko became the culmination of this meeting, and it was quite frankly for all of us. Doroshenko was the beloved disciple of Neusykhin, he lovingly fussed with him more than with anyone from us. Vasilii Doroshenko, who had just defended his thesis about the social history of Saxony in the 9th – 13th centuries, did not use such unbridled terminology, like the previous speaker, but he said that Neusykhin, of course, is the greatest expert, but his ideas are far Marxism, and therefore lessons of Neusykhin were fraught with great difficulties, because he had to internally adjust what teacher inspired him. The speech of Doroshenko plunged us into a stupor ... Aleksandr Iosifovich, excited by this situation, answered briefly, but he very definitely emphasised that, unlike Vasilii Doroshenko, who discontented in his supervisor, he was quite satisfied with the very good work of his pupil and believed that as academic supervisor assisted to the appropriate level of his dissertation. Therefore, he was surprised and distressed by criticism of Doroshenko...”¹³.

Gutnova described this non-academic episode in the history of Soviet medieval studies more radically: “there was one of his students, a graduate student Vasilii Doroshenko was speaking with hysterical accusations to his

¹¹ Uvarov, 2007.

¹² Buligina, 2014.

¹³ Gurevich, 2004.

teacher: ‘We trusted you, and you have deceived us!’. He cried it hysterically¹⁴. Transcript of Doroshenko’s speech was published in 2007, and its text differs from Gutnova’s memoirs¹⁵. Doroshenko in his speech tried to combine his brief reflections about historian’s craft and his ideas about the genesis of historical knowledge with lengthy political declarations. On the one hand, he emphasised that “historian must distinguish in the material trends that shape the next stage of historical development”. On the other hand, he accused Neusykhin that he “does not know Marxism and Leninism, does not know the Marxist-Leninist theory, does not want to apply it, and where he tries to apply it, he distorts”. Neusykhin in his response attempted to argue with Doroshenko: “you are wrong, wrong in your statement that I do not know Marxism... I know Marxism of Marx from the young age... but you are a very capable student, and I am pleased with your thesis”¹⁶. Gurevich in his comments on Doroshenko’s speech of 1949 presumed:

“Vasilii Doroshenko was the favourite graduate student of Aleksandr Iosifovich, who took part in the discussion of his dissertation about the social development of Saxony in the Carolingian era. Vasilii Doroshenko has extensive knowledge and ability to deeply and accurately analyse historical sources... I remember his pensive look and serious statements... How can we understand that this man spoke haltingly and illogically?.. I have the impression that he was confused and demoralised... Doroshenko was forced to perform social order... he was awarded and accepted to the staff of the Department of the History of the Middle Ages, but unpleasant situation emerged around Doroshenko and one year later he resigned and went to Riga... Doroshenko was used and then thrown out”¹⁷.

Doroshenko was one of the brightest and tragic figures in a history of Soviet Medieval studies. He left Moscow State University in 1951. Janis Zutis, one of the leading Latvian historians, initiated his invitation to Riga. In Riga he began his studies in the history of Latvia. His academic career in the Latvian SSR was formally successful and prosperous¹⁸. Riga period in the life of Vasilii Doroshenko provided him with possibilities to work more actively with texts of Latvian and German historians, the second half of the 1980s opened new academic possibilities and Doroshenko visited Sweden where he worked in the local archives. Academic biography of Doroshenko simultaneously had a lot in common and it also was different from other sim-

¹⁴ Gutnova, 2001, 263.

¹⁵ Mil’skaia, 2002.

¹⁶ Stenogramma... 23 marta 1949 goda, 2007.

¹⁷ Gurevich, 2007.

¹⁸ Although Aleksandr Gorfunkel’ insists that some of his colleagues “felt themselves alone” because it was difficult or even impossible to integrate their research style into Soviet official canon (Gorfunkel’, 2013). And Moisei Al’perovich believed that the situation in provincial universities was more conducive for academic freedoms, but the Soviet ideological censorship dominated over regional historians no less than over their counterparts and colleagues in Moscow (Al’perovich, 1997).

ilar personal trajectories of Soviet medievalists. Doroshenko did not openly disagree with Soviet historiographical canon, but he formally also did not use non-Soviet approaches as Aron Gurevich did. Gurevich and Doroshenko in their studies of the history of the Middle Ages actually reached the similar ideas and they came closer to denial and revision of ideological roots and backgrounds of the Soviet historiography.

Sergei Kozlov¹⁹ suggests that some historians felt better in isolation because they preferred to promote new ideas and new forms of history writing actively. Vasili Doroshenko in his academic biography actualized the way of historians-individuals who could not find their place in the academic community in spite of the formal progress in the university career. The forced participation in the ideological and political actions of the late 1940s on the rising wave of Soviet official anti-Semitism significantly and decisively influenced the academic destiny of Doroshenko. This traumatic experience made him form his own tactics, strategies and forms of intellectual archaeology and archaeology of knowledge. Political mistakes of youth predetermined limits, borders, and frontiers of personal academic freedom and permanently stimulated Vasili Doroshenko to correlate the will of the historian with demands and threats of ideological loyalty and self-censorship.

Symbolic communication and culture of gift in the community of Soviet medievalists. The author presumes that it will be primitivization and simplification to reduce the history of Soviet Medieval studies only and exclusively to its formal dimensions because informal relations were no less important than the institutionalised forms of communication between the representatives of the academic community or specialised historiographical guilds, including medievalists, with power. Frederic Maitland²⁰, English historian at the end of the 19th century suggested that history has hidden informal levels and summarised his ideas in the concept of "beyond". Contemporary Russian historian Vladimir Ryzhkovskii suggested that the Soviet Medieval studies also had its own "beyond". Ryzhkovskii presumes that "beyond" is not "transfer of successes and achievements, not honouring of distinguished figures, not summarising of successful results, but it is the narrative of defaults, transactions with conscience and conformist decisions"²¹.

Analysing relationships and forms of communication in the community of Soviet medievalists, it is very tempting to extrapolate medieval feudal relations on the situation in Latvian Soviet Medieval studies. Leonid Batkin called one of his articles "O tom, kak A.Ia. Gurevich vozdeleyval svoi allod" ("On how Gurevich cultivated his allodium")²² and attempted to compare

¹⁹ Kozlov, 2004.

²⁰ Maitland, 1907.

²¹ Ryzhkovskii, 2009.

²² Batkin, 1994.

historiographical impacts of Gurevich with values and principles of medieval hierarchy. The author of this article presumes that the parallels between feudal social relations and organisation of Soviet academic communities are relevant in the system of relationships among Soviet medievalists in general. The relationships between historians had the character of vassalage and suzerainty. Janis Zutis, Academician of Academy of Sciences of LSSR, was informal suzerain and lord for Soviet Latvian medievalists, who were his vassals and he symbolically sanctioned and legalised their activities in this intellectual and cultural situation. "Srednie veka" after the death of Jānis Zutis published the collective obituary, which was a form of the bequest. Pavel Uvarov presumes that the community of Soviet medievalists was unique because "professional ethics was mixed with the keen sense of service"²³. The figure of Jānis Zutis had the sacred and symbolic character in this situation for Latvian Soviet medievalists. Jānis Zutis as a member of the Soviet academic elite distributed imagined allods and feuds as real and symbolic gifts. Soviet medieval studies in this context developed as an exchange of gifts between participants of academic corporation or guild.

The internal emigration of Vasilii Doroshenko to Riga was an attempt to change his academic suzerain. His emigration to Riga became an act of commendation or recognition of his subordinated positions in the Soviet system of higher historical education in particular and Medievalism in general. Official representatives of Moscow community of Soviet medievalists in the late 1940s used Doroshenko, and a year later they used principles of corporate ethics of their academic community, he (in)formally belonged to, against him. The principles of corporate ethics among Soviet medievalists were informal in nature and rooted in tradition, but they allowed Moscow colleagues to marginalise Doroshenko and they simultaneously provided Latvian medievalists with the right to take him in their academic guild. Doroshenko in this cultural and intellectual situation practised his ideological and historiographical serfdom in Latvia from 1951 to the early 1990s.

Intellectual situations in Latvian historiography of the early 1950s.

Svetlana Ryzhakova presumes that "Latvian history, as well as any national history, is a special genre of metanarrative, the main its principle is promotion of historical narrative about the Latvian nation, and all earlier its historical forms including Latvian ethnicity and archaic Latvian tribal communities"²⁴. Historians of Latvia by the time when Vasilii Doroshenko left Moscow for Riga already achieved some successes and results²⁵ in the studies of medieval Latvian history. Evgenii Dobrenko, Russian and English historian of Soviet literature, in the first half of the 1990s suggested that socialist real-

²³ Uvarov, 2006.

²⁴ Ryzhakova, 2009.

²⁵ Balodis, 1938; Spekke 1938, 1948, 1957; Švābe 1925 (1990), 1921, 1922.

ism developed as literary and cultural mutations and presumed that it was a form of “mutagenic culture”²⁶. The denationalisation of history and ideologically motivated attempts to write it as the history of classes and class struggle in intellectual situation of hard ideological pressure, total control, and denial of historiographical heritage of the past made impossible further development of historical science in national system of coordinates²⁷. The National and ethnic paradigm of mythmaking dominated in the historiography of interwar Latvia, but Sovietization of Latvian historiography forced historians to radically change their theoretical and methodological preferences and began to write a history of Latvia as a predominantly socio-economic, focused on the history of social groups and class contradictions.

Soviet authorities in the beginning of the 1950s achieved some results in the Sovietization of Latvian intellectual situation²⁸, including historiography, its unification with Soviet historiographical landscapes, academic cultures and officially adopted and approved practices and strategies of histories writing. The mechanisms and new forms of unification of formally new Soviet republics with the rest of the Soviet Union were relatively united and founding fathers of Soviet ideological discourse by 1940 and 1944 had considerable experience in standardisation and control of Russian academic historiography and other fields of culture. Evgenii Dobrenko presumes that Soviet authoritarian cultural discourse developed in different forms of subjugation and domestication of writers as ideal manufacturers of textualised intellectual products and later readers as its customers²⁹. The same cultural situation emerged in Sovietized historiography of Latvia, where regional communist authorities Sovietized sphere of production of knowledge and their promotion among Soviet consumers, who consumed politically and ideologically motivated intellectual knowledge.

Vasilii Doroshenko did not begin his career in Latvian feudal history studies in the situation of intellectual and historiographical vacuum. Soviet ideological officials radically and decisively rejected the pre-Soviet Latvian historical narratives³⁰, including the achievements and successes of Latvian historians in their studies of the history of the Middle Ages. The Soviet authorities attempted to Sovietize Latvian historiography and invented period between the two world wars as era when bourgeois nationalism and reactionary historians dominated. Historiographical predecessors of Vasilii Doroshenko can be divided into three groups, including Baltic German historiography, Latvian national historiography and Sovietized Latvian historio-

²⁶ Dobrenko, 1993.

²⁷ Usmanova, 2003, 350–351.

²⁸ Ivanovs 2003, 2005, 2007; Strods, 2005; Biron A., Biron M. 1981.

²⁹ Dobrenko, 1999; 1997.

³⁰ Ryzhakova, 2009.

graphy. German interwar historiography by the beginning of the 1950s had controversial and marginal status. Forced integration of Latvian historiography in the Soviet ideological canon assisted and stimulated consistent marginalisation of interwar Baltic and German historiographies and politically motivated ignorance of their achievements in studies of Medieval Latvian history. Soviet historians imagined German historiography as reactionary and noble. The official historians imagined Latvian interwar historiography as “bourgeois nationalist”. Sovietization radically changed the methodological principles of development of Latvian historiography in general.

Sovietization of Latvian historiography radically changed collective-singulars, which earlier in the 1940s were the usual and normal for Latvian historians. The collective-singulars are classified concepts that allow the historian to analyse and systemise groups of heterogeneous facts. The collective-singulars include as abstract universal knowledge as references to concrete historical experience³¹. The ideas of national independence, national movement, European choice, cultural and state history before Sovietization formed the stable core of the collective-singulars in Latvian historiography. Sovietization radically replaced them by social classes, the class struggle, liberation movement, social and economic histories that began to identify key vectors and the main trajectories of intellectual transformations.

Vasilii Doroshenko unlike his new Latvian colleagues had not social and ideological sins as education in the bourgeois university. His professional knowledge of original Western bourgeois historiography was predominantly critical. Doroshenko as other Soviet historians imagined bourgeois historiography as the political enemy and universal object for ideologically sanctioned criticism. P. Uvarov, analysing the Soviet medieval studies, presumes that “the existential drama of medievalists was that they could not visit the countries, they specialised in, and they could not work in its archives. Thus, they... become dependent on the sources published by ‘bourgeois’ historians... the corporation was able an adequate response to this challenge, it developed the historian’s ability to find the most unexpected sources and find new meanings and senses in the well-known texts”³². Vasilii Doroshenko after an internal exile in Riga in this cultural context was in a better situation than his former colleagues in Moscow who continued to specialise in classic Western feudalism. His impacts in studies of the medieval history of Saxony could be an incentive for the development of Latvian Medieval studies in the context of its Europeanization. The author presumes that ideological birth traumas of Soviet historiography inspired the integration of Doroshenko in Latvian historiography and his attempts to describe the history of Latvia as simultaneously social and economic. Politically and ideologi-

³¹ Kopusov, 2018, 80, 85.

³² Uvarov, 2006.

cally motivated deportation of Vasilii Doroshenko also became an attempt to release and deliver Latvian historiographical canon from ethnocentric and national romantic interpretations and explanations, which dominated in it.

The citations as gifts in the Soviet historiography. Two books of Vasilii Doroshenko “Ocherki agrarnoi istorii Latvii v XVI veke” (“Essays on the agrarian history of Latvia in the XVI century”)³³ and “Myza i rynek. Hoziaistvo Rizhskoi iezuitskoi kollegii na rubezhe XVI i XVII vekov” (“Muiža and the market. The facilities of Riga Jesuit College at the turn of the XVI and XVII cc.”), published in 1960 and 1973, form the hard core of the sources in the author’s further attempts to explore intellectual archeology, formation, development and transformation of collective and individual knowledge, understanding and representations about medieval past of Latvia and its feudal history. P. Uvarov presumes that “Soviet historians were ready to accuse their colleagues originally in Menshevism and Trotskyism, later in cosmopolitanism, and later in structuralism and the preparation of ‘sabotage without dynamite’; therefore academic articles often reminded denunciations, denunciations looked like academic articles. The exposing of enemies became the attribute of Soviet historiography: somebody did it with obvious pleasure, few with difficulty overcame the threshold of disgust, others did it without hesitation because it was the discursive practice”³⁴. These informal orders significantly influenced the intellectual and cultural archaeology of texts written by Soviet medievalists. Academic interests of Vasilii Doroshenko in a history of the Middle Ages were significantly different from the general trends in Soviet medieval studies. P. Uvarov in his interview with Adelaida Svanidze suggested that Soviet historians in the 1970s began actively explore problems of the medieval cities, and the urban social history became one of priority themes. A. Svanidze also presumed that in the 1970s “works of almost the same type on histories of craft guilds appeared and they confirmed the fact that guilds developed in many countries and cities, and they were similar in the main their parameters of the organisation”³⁵.

Despite this historiographical fashion, Doroshenko in Riga continued to study problems of predominantly agrarian history. Priority to different dimensions of agrarian history predestined intellectual archaeologies of his texts when he cited his predecessors and contemporaries. He mentioned the texts of his historiographical predecessors in the introductory part of his book “Essays on the agrarian history of Latvia in the XVI century”³⁶. Soviet medievalists periodically actualize their ideological functions³⁷ and inspired col-

³³ Doroshenko, 1960.

³⁴ Uvarov, 2007.

³⁵ Svanidze, 2013.

³⁶ Doroshenko, 1960.

³⁷ Sovetskaia medievistika, 1960.

leagues criticise and expose western historiography. The concept of otherness³⁸ was central and critical for the Soviet culture of memory and historiographical cultures. Doroshenko mentioned “aristocratic and bourgeois literature”, “representatives of Baltic-German aristocratic historiography” and “local bourgeois historiography of Latvia”. He presumed that Arveds Švābe, located and mentally mapped by him in “bourgeois historiography”, was the “most prominent” among its representatives, who “collected many facts from the life of feudal estates and the peasantry... and found many valuable sources of local and Swedish archives”. Doroshenko limited his ideological criticism of Švābe³⁹ by reproach that the historian was a supporter of the “bourgeois-nationalist ideology” and “paid great attention to the situation of the serfs, but clearly preferred to analyse the legal dimensions of the feudal system”. The accusations in “bourgeois nationalism” in Doroshenko’s book neighbored with relatively objective contemplations of Švābe’s works. And Doroshenko carefully listed the problems that Švābe ignored in his books.

On the other hand, the Soviet historian admitted that his formal bourgeois predecessor “analysed in details the evolution of land rights, the spread of serfdom in the stratum of the rural population”. These ideologically adjusted statements were, in fact, an attempt to actualize the problems politically ignored by Soviet historiography. Vasilii Doroshenko in the intellectual situation also did not analyse these aspects, but he was able to mention them. He preferred, on the one hand, to limit himself by formal declarations that his historiographical predecessors “paid primary attention to the period of the Livonian Order’s dominance”⁴⁰. On the other hand, he recognised that some of the texts published by German historians had “the great value”. Doroshenko identified the works of his predecessors and German historians almost neutrally as “old works” and identified some of their ideas as “untenable”.

Doroshenko recognised that academic activities of the representatives of Baltic German historiography assisted to “identification of new documentary sources and the analysis of many private, but important issues”. He briefly analysed the texts of Robert Wipper⁴¹, Mitrofan Doņnar-Zapol’ski⁴², Jānis Bērziņš⁴³ and stated their “undoubtedly essential role in the studies of certain problems of Latvian agrarian history”. Vasilii Doroshenko in his attempts to describe historiography entered symbolic act of communication with his predecessors and contemporaries. He expressed recognition and loyalty to Jānis Zutis who in the early 1950s initiated his emigration in Riga.

³⁸ Makarov, 2007.

³⁹ Švābe, 1926; 1930; 1941; Schwabe, 1928;.

⁴⁰ Doroshenko, 1960, 4–8.

⁴¹ Wipper, 1930; Vipper, 1944.

⁴² Doņnar-Zapol’ski. 1900.

⁴³ Bērziņš, 1935.

The citation was a form of the symbolic historiographical gift, but it is very interesting that Vasili Doroshenko was greedy on gifts for Marxist-Leninist classics and quoted Friedrich Engels's work "Anti-Dühring" only once in the 269th page of his book "Essays on the agrarian history of Latvia in the XVI century". The culture of citation on Latvian Soviet Medievalism had symbolic and declarative nature and actualized predominantly author's style, rather than his ideological loyalty. These trends without any semantic modifications also prevailed in Doroshenko's article, published in "Srednie veka" in 1962⁴⁴. In the introduction to his book on the agrarian history of Latvia in the 16th century he mentioned only 19 original works of his predecessors among 47 footnotes. The most of these footnotes in the Introduction lists published and unpublished sources, author's comments and remarks. Only three original works mentioned in the footnotes were formally texts of Soviet historians. Robert Whipper, who between the two world wars, lived in Latvia, was one of them. Jānis Zutis⁴⁵ formally was the only cited Soviet historian, but he was a representative of national historiography.

The rest of the 16 texts⁴⁶ mentioned and cited by Doroshenko represented various tendencies of "bourgeois" and "nationalist" historiography. Doroshenko, as a Soviet historian, commented advantages and disadvantages of their works too quiet and even objectively without ideological orthodoxy. The same situation was characteristic for his book "Muiža and the market. The facilities of Riga Jesuit College at the turn of the XVI and XVII centuries"⁴⁷, published in 1973, where he preferred to cite only sources. These practical approaches in quotations actualized the general trends in the symbolic exchange of gifts between Soviet medievalists. Mihail Boitsov presumes that "there is no history, understood as a narrative about the past without the communities which create, maintain and modify their visions of the past and there is no community without its own historical narrative"⁴⁸.

The historiographical culture of Doroshenko formed his intellectual archaeology and it was also unique because he formally was the Soviet historian, but he limited himself by citations from Latvian pre-Soviet and Soviet historians. He could cite ritually recognised classics of Soviet medieval studies, but he preferred to ignore them. When historians of the Union republics could not quote and mention their Moscow colleagues, Moscow historians⁴⁹

⁴⁴ Doroshenko, 1962.

⁴⁵ Zutis, 1949.

⁴⁶ Engelhardt, 1897; Transche-Roseneck, 1926; Johansen, 1927; Bosse, 1933; Stakelberg, 1926; Soom, 1956; Hellmann, 1954; Niitemaa, 1952; Jakubowski, Kordzikowski, 1915.

⁴⁷ Doroshenko, 1973.

⁴⁸ Boitsov, 2013, 395.

⁴⁹ Gutnova, 1966.

were silent about the successes and achievements of the historians, including medievalists from the Union republics. The problems of mutual influences of the texts of Soviet medievalists are among extremely difficult and discussive problems, but the author presumes that Adelaida Svanidze's book "Medieval city and the market in Sweden"⁵⁰ became the intellectual reaction to Doroshenko's attempts to promote predominantly agrarian centric paradigm in studies of a history of feudalism.

Igor' Smirnov states that "the extreme originality of totalitarian culture expressed in the fact that it did not taboo individual forms of life activity, but prohibited human as an abstract universal subject in general"⁵¹. Vasili Doroshenko quoted and referred non-Soviet and bourgeois historians and present them symbolic gifts, but he also avoids the similar rituals in his acts of symbolic communication with Soviet historiography, he formally belonged to.

Preliminary conclusions. Cultures of citation or conscious, intentional, politically and ideologically motivated ignorance of historiographical predecessors and contemporaries become a unique invented tradition in Latvian Soviet Medieval studies. Its genesis and further historiographical transformations became the results of dependency of Soviet Latvian historians, as medieval Latvian peasants, from political and ideological obligations, but they were politically and ideologically different and developed as partly symbolic. The ideological and political preferences stimulated quotations, citations or ignorance of works and texts of predecessors. Latvian nationalism became a factor that authorised tactics and practices of the intellectual behaviour of Soviet Latvian historians. Soviet historians could adversely quote representatives of Baltic German historiography, but their own political and ideological values and nationalist righteous anger of a young nation determined academic and historiographical preferences of Latvian historian.

The centuries of national oppression radically influenced on academic culture of Latvian intellectuals. The criticism of "bourgeois nationalists" demanded great skills from representatives of Latvian Soviet historiography. Soviet "political scholars" who specialised in criticism of "bourgeois nationalism", accepted these imagined ideological demands easier than traditional historians, including medievalists, because Mārgers Štepermanis and Teodors Zeids made their first steps in historiography when "bourgeois nationalists" were among their colleagues. Citation or non-citation became forms of symbolic communication between representatives of Latvian Soviet historiography with other Soviet or bourgeois historians. Latvian Soviet historians could praise and little criticises their Soviet colleagues. Criticism and exposure also became universal forms and means of communication with the bourgeois historians, but this communication was predominantly one-sided

⁵⁰ Svanidze, 1980.

⁵¹ Smirnov, 2000.

because of many bourgeois non-Marxist historians, criticised and censured by Soviet historians, was far from them geographically or died and they could not respond to criticism of Soviet Latvian medievalists.

The citations and non-citations in Latvian Soviet Medieval studies actualized origins and roots of its intellectual archaeology in particular and archaeology of the Sovietised historical knowledge in general. The different historiographical schools and theoretical approaches in the intellectual archaeology of Latvian Soviet medievalism had a lot in common with cultural horizons, traditional archaeologists work with. The semi-ritual practices and cultures of citation or non-citation in Soviet Latvian medieval studies since the critical moments of Sovietization to erosion of Soviet historiography in the late 1980s become formal and informal invented traditions. These invented traditions proposed mechanisms and procedures Latvian community of medievalists existed and developed in from the early 1940s to late 1980s. Latvian medievalists become like the object of their study because they formed their formal and informal rules, laws, regulations and forms of symbolic communications including the exchange of gifts' rituals.

БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ

- Альперович М. Историк в тоталитарном обществе (профессионально-биографические заметки) // *Одиссей* 1997. Человек в истории. Культурная история социального. М.: Наука, 1997. С. 251–274.
- Баткин Л. О том, как А.Я. Гуревич возделывал свои аллюды // *Одиссей*. Человек в истории. Картина мира в народном и ученом сознании. М.: Наука, 1994. С. 5–28.
- Бирон А., Бирон М. Становление Советской историографии Латвии. 20-е и 30-е годы XX века. Рига: Зинатне, 1981.
- Бойцов М. Несколько меланхолических тезисов об истории и глобализации // *Как мы пишем историю* / ред. Г. Дуфауд, Г. Гаррета, Л. Пименова. М.: РОССПЭН, 2013. С. 393–413.
- Васильев А. Современные memory studies и трансформация классического наследия // *Диалоги со временем: память о прошлом в контексте истории* / сост. Л.П. Репина. М.: Кругъ, 2008. С. 19–49.
- Вольфцун Л. Лев Семенович Гордон: судьба историка // *Одиссей* 1998. Человек в истории. Личность и общество: проблем самоидентификации. М.: Наука, 1999. С. 204–222.
- Галямичев А. Медиевистика в Саратовском университете (страницы истории) // *Средневековый город 15*. Саратов: Изд-во Саратовского университета, 2002. С. 3 – 12.
- Галямичев А. Медиевистика в Саратовском университете: очерки истории (1917–1977). Саратов: Изд-во Саратовского университета, 2010. 116 с.
- Галямичев А. Медиевисты петербургской (ленинградской) школы в Саратовском университете // *Диалог со временем*. Вып. 10. 2003. С. 289–299.
- Горфункель А. Заметки о воспоминаниях А.Я. Гуревича “история историка” // Горфункель А. Труд науки и извороты шарлатанства. О ремесле историка. СПб.: Дмитрий Буланин, 2013. С. 410–414.
- Гуревич А. Грехопадение московских медиевистов: дискуссия 1949 года и ее последствия // *Одиссей*. Человек в истории. История как игра метафор: метафоры истории, общества и политики. М.: Наука, 2007. С. 341–349.
- Гуревич А. Историк среди руин: Попытка критического прочтения мемуаров Е.В. Гутновой // *Средние века*, 2002, Вып. 63, С. 362–393.
- Гуревич А. История историка. М.: РОССПЭН, 2004.
- Гуревич А.Я. Апории современной исторической науки – мнимые и подлинные // *Одиссей* 1997. Человек в истории. Культурная история социального. М.: Наука, 1997. С. 233–250.

- Гутнова Е. Пережитое. М.: РОССПЭН, 2001.
- Гутнова Е. Пятьдесят лет советской медиэвистики // Средние века, 1967, Вып. 30, С. 3–40.
- Добренко Е. Метафора власти. Литература сталинской эпохи в историческом освещении. Мюнхен: Верлаг Отто Сагнер, 1993.
- Добренко Е. Формовка советского читателя. Социальные и эстетические предпосылки рецепции Советской литературы. СПб.: Академический проект, 1997.
- Добренко, Е. Формовка советского писателя. Социальные и эстетические истоки Советской литературной культуры. СПб.: Академический проект, 1999.
- Дорошенко В. Мыза и рынок. Хозяйство Рижской незуитской коллегии на рубеже XVI и XVII веков. Рига: Зинатне, 1973. 187 с.
- Дорошенко В. Очерки аграрной истории Латвии в XVI веке. Рига, 1960. 325 с.
- Дорошенко, В. Мызно-барщинное хозяйство в южной (латышской) части Лифляндии в XVI веке // Средние века, 1962, 21, С. 122–140; 22, С. 100–115.
- Дубровский А. Историк и власть: историческая наука в СССР и концепция истории феодальной России в контексте политики и идеологии (1930–1950-е гг.). Брянск: Изд-во Брянского государственного университета им. акад. И.Г. Петровского, 2005. 800 с.
- Зутис Я. Очерки по историографии Латвии. Прибалтийско-немецкая историография. Рига, 1949.
- Козлов С. “Определенный способ заниматься наукой”: Карло Гинзбург и традиция // Гинзбург К. Мифы – эмблемы – приметы: морфология и история. М.: Новое издательство, 2004. С. 321–345.
- Копосов Н. Историческое понятие в мире без будущего // Как мы пишем историю / ред. Г. Дуфауд, Г. Гаррета, Л. Пименова. М.: РОССПЭН, 2013. С. 57–93.
- Копосов Н. Как думают историки. М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 2001.
- Лебедева Г., Якубский В. *Cathedra Medii Aevi*: материалы к истории ленинградской медиэвистики 1930–1950-х годов. СПб.: Изд-во С.-Петербургского ун-та, 2007. 125 с.
- Макаров А. Образ Другого как образ памяти (Методологические аспекты проблемы репрезентации прошлого) // Диалог со временем, 2007, № 18, С. 6–18.
- Мильская Л. Воспоминания Е.В. Гутновой и их достоверность // Средние века, 2002, Вып. 63, С. 394–401.
- Репина Л. Идеи – концепции – люди, или как писать историю медиэвистики сегодня? (К 100-летию Е.В. Гутновой) // Средние века, 2014, № 75 (3–4). С. 406–422.
- Репина Л. Образы прошлого в памяти и в истории // Образы прошлого и коллективная идентичность в Европе до начала нового времени / сост. Л. Репина. М.: Кругъ, 2003. С. 9–18.
- Рыжакова С. Латышская национальная история: о культурных механизмах в конструировании и реферировании прошлого // Антропологический форум, 2009, № 11, С. 216–274.
- Рыжковский В. Советская медиэвистика and beyond (к истории одной дискуссии) // Новое литературное обозрение, 2009, № 97.
- Сванидзе А. Грани Средневековья. Калейдоскоп. М.: Новый хронограф, 2013. С. 391–414.
- Сванидзе А. Несколько слов об исторической памяти в связи с автобиографией историка // Средние века, 2002. Вып. 63. С. 359–361.
- Сванидзе А. Средневековый город и рынок в Швеции XIII–XV веков. М.: Наука, 1980.
- Свешников А. Советская медиэвистика в идеологической борьбе 1930–1940-х годов // Новое литературное обозрение. 2008. № 90.
- Смирнов И. Соцреализм: антропологическое измерение // Соцреалистический канон / ред. Х. Гюнтер, Е. Добренко. СПб.: Академический проект, 2000. С. 16 – 30.
- Советская медиэвистика и ее задачи в области историографии // Средние века, 1960, Вып. 15, С. 52–55.
- Стам С. Моя жизнь, учителя и наука. Саратов: Изд-во Саратовского ун-та, 2009. 358 с.
- Стенограмма объединенного заседания сектора истории Средних веков Института истории АН СССР и кафедры истории Средних веков Московского государственного университета 23 марта 1949 года // Одиссей. Человек в истории. История как игра метафор: метафоры истории, общества и политики. Москва: Наука, 2007. С. 253–340.

- Уваров П. Портрет медиевиста на фоне корпорации // НЛЮ, 2006, № 81, С. 194–208.
- Уваров П. Свобода у историков пока есть. Во всяком случае – есть от чего бежать // Неприкосновенный запас, 2007, № 55.
- Усманова Д. Создавая национальную историю татар: историографические и интеллектуальные дебаты на рубеже веков // *Ab imperio*, 2003, № 3.
- Харитонович Д. Современность Средневековья // *Новый мир*, 2000, № 10.
- Юрганов А. Русское национальное государство. Жизненный мир историков эпохи сталинизма. Москва: РГГУ, 2011.
- Balodis A. Klasiskā atmiņas izpratne: mne me un anamnesis // *Latvijas Universitātes raksti*. 2007. 713. sēj. *Filosofija*. 7. – 18. lpp.
- Balodis F. Senākie laiki. Latviešu senvēsture, Latviešu vēsture. 1. seļ., 1. daļa. Rīga: Valsts papīra spiestuve, 1938. 11. – 215. lpp.
- Bērziņš J. Ērgļu un Turaidas pils saimniecība XVI gadusimtena 80-tos gados // *Valsts arhīva raksti*. Rīga, 1935. 3. – 55. lpp.
- Bosse H. Der livländische Bauer am Ausgang der Ordenszeit (bis 1561) // *Mitteilungen aus der livländischen Geschichte*, 1933, Bd. 24, S. 281–389.
- Buligina A. Apgaismība un kritika: brīvība publiskā prāta lietojumā Imanuela Kanta filozofijā // *Latvijas Universitātes raksti*. 2014. 804. sēj. *Filosofija*. Cilvēks un patība – aktualitātes un perspektīvas, 6. – 15. lpp.
- Dorošenko V. Piezīmes (Pēc kara Maskavā: 1945. – 1949) // *Latvijas Arhīvi*, 2002, no 1, 113. – 121. lpp.
- Dorošenko V. Piezīmes (Rīgā 1961. – 1984) // *Latvijas Arhīvi*, 2002, no 2, 115. – 124. lpp.
- Engelhardt H. Beitrag zur Entstehung der Gutsherrschaft in Livland während der Ordenszeit. Leipzig – Riga, 1897.
- Hellmann M. Das Lettenland im Mittelalter. Münster – Köln, 1954.
- Ivanovs A. Latvijas PSR historiogrāfija: (konceptuāls pārskats) // *Latvijas Vēsture*, 2003, No 2, 75. – 83. lpp.; No 3, 69. – 77. lpp.
- Ivanovs A. Padoņņu politika Latvijā 20. gadsimta 50. gadu otrajā pusē – 80. gadu vidū: izpētes gaita, rezultāti un turpmākā perspektīva (historiogrāfisks apskats) // *Latvijas vēsture* 20. gadsimta 40.–90. gados. Latvijas Vēsturisku komisijas 2006. gada pētījumi. Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2007. 305. – 355. lpp.
- Ivanovs A. Sovietization of Latvian Historiography 1944–1959: Overview // *The hidden and forbidden history of Latvia under Soviet and Nazi occupations 1940–1991*. Riga: Institute of the History of Latvia, 2005. P. 256 – 270.
- Jakubowski J., Kordzikowski J. Polska w XVI wieku. Inflanty. Warszawa, 1915.
- Johansen P. Siedlung und Agrarwesen der Esten im Mittelalter // *Deutsche Siedlungsforschungen*. Festschrift für Kötzschke. Leipzig und Berlin. 1927.
- Maitland F. Domesday book and beyond: three essays in the early history of England. Cambridge: University Press, 1907.
- Niitemaa V. Der Binnenhandel in der Politik der livländischen Städte im Mittelalter. Helsinki, 1952.
- Rubene M. Laiks autobiogrāfiskajā rakstībā: Virdžīnija Vulfā, Simona de Bovuāra un Anna Brigadere // *Latvijas Universitātes raksti*. 2014. 804. sēj. *Filosofija*. Cilvēks un patība – aktualitātes un perspektīvas, 63. – 73. lpp.
- Schwabe A. Grundriss der Agrargeschichte Lettlands. Riga, 1928.
- Soom A. Gutswirtschaft in Livland am Ausgang des XVI Jahrhunderts // *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung*, 1956. Bd. 5. Marburg, S. 34–57.
- Spekke A. Baltu tautas kristīgās ēras pirmajā gadu tūkstoši // *Tautas Vēsturei*. Rīga: A. Gulbis, 1938. 61. – 76. lpp.
- Spekke A. History of Latvia: An Outline. Stockholm: Daugava, 1957.
- Spekke A. Latvijas vēsture. Latvju tautas likteņcīņas Eiropas krustceļos. Stokholma, 1948.
- Stakelberg F. Der Landbesitz im Kreise Pernau zur Ordenszeit // *Sitzungsberichte der Altertumsforschenden zu Pernau*, 1928, Bd. VIII, S. 143–205.
- Strods H. Latvijas sovetizācija (1944. – 1959.) // *Totalitārie režīmi Baltijā: izpētes rezultāti un problēmas*. Starptautiskās konferences materiāli, 2004. gada 3. – 4. jūnijs, Rīga: Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2005. 173. – 192. lpp.

- Švābe A. Latvijas vēsture. Rīga: Avots, 1925 [1990].
- Švābe A. Latvju kultūras vēsture. 1. – 2. sej. Rīga: A. Gulbis, 1921, 1922.
- Švābe A. Pagasta vēsture. Rīga, 1926.
- Švābe A. Priekšvārds // Vidzemes saimniecības vēstures avoti 1553. – 1618. g. Rīga, 1941. V – XXVIII. lpp.
- Švābe A. Zemes attiecību un zemes reformu vēsture Latvijā. Rīga, 1930.
- Transche-Roseneck A. Die Entstehung der Schollenpflichtigkeit in Livland // Mitteilungen aus der livländischen Geschichte, 1926, Bd. 23, S. 485–574.
- Vasilijš V. Dorošenko (25.01.1921.-24.03.1992.) // Latvijas Vēstures Institūta žurnāls, 1992, no 2, 206. – 207. lpp.
- Wipper R. Die Zeit der Leibeigenschaft // Die Letten. Aufsätze über Geschichte, Sprache und Kultur der alten Letten. Rīga, 1930. S. 164–191.
- Zutis J. Vidzeme kā poļu un zviedru cīņas objects. Rīga, 1949.

REFERENCES

- Al'perovich M. Istorik v totalitarnom obshchestve (professional'no-biograficheskie zametki) // Odissei 1997. Chelovek v istorii. Kul'turnaia istoriia sotsial'nogo. Moskva: Nauka, 1997. S. 251–274.
- Balodis A. Klasiskā atmiņas izpratne: mneme un anamnesis // Latvijas Universitātes raksti. 2007. 713. sēj. Filosofija. 7. – 18. lpp.
- Balodis F. Senākie laiki. Latviešu senvēsture, Latviešu vēsture. 1. sej., 1. daļa. Rīga: Valsts papīra spiestuve, 1938. 11. – 215. lpp.
- Batkin L. O tom, kak A.Ia. Gurevich vozdeľyval svoi allod // Odissei. Chelovek v istorii. Kartina mira v narodnom i uchenom soznanii. Moskva: Nauka, 1994. S. 5–28.
- Bērziņš J. Ērgļu un Turaidas pils saimniecība XVI gadusimtena 80-tos gados // Valsts arhīva raksti. Rīga, 1935. 3. – 55. lpp.
- Biron A., Biron M. Stanovlenie sovetskoj istoriografii Latvii. 20-e i 30-e gody XX veka. Riga: Zinatne, 1981.
- Boitsov M. Neskol'ko melanholicheskikh tezisov ob istorii i globalizatsii // Kak my pishem istoriiu / red. G. Dufaud, G. Garreta, L. Pimenova. Moskva: Rosspen, 2013. S. 393–413.
- Bosse H. Der livländische Bauer am Ausgang der Ordenszeit (bis 1561) // Mitteilungen aus der livländischen Geschichte, 1933, Bd. 24, S. 281–389.
- Buligina A. Apgaismība un kritika: brīvība publiskā prāta lietojumā Imanuela Kanta filozofijā // Latvijas Universitātes raksti. 2014. 804. sēj. Filosofija. Cilvēks un patība – aktualitātes un perspektīvas, 6. – 15. lpp.
- Dobrenko E. Metafora valsti. Literatura stalinskoj epohi v istoricheskom osvshchenii. München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1993.
- Dobrenko E. Formovka sovetskogo chitatelia. Sotsial'nye i esteticheskie predposylki retseptsii sovetskoj literatury. Sankt-Peterburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1997.
- Dobrenko E. Formovka sovetskogo pisatelja. Sotsial'nye i esteticheskie istoki sovetskoj literaturnoi kul'tury. Sankt-Peterburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1999.
- Dorošenko V. Piezīmes (Pēc kara Maskavā: 1945. – 1949) // Latvijas Arhīvi, 2002, no 1, 113. – 121. lpp.
- Dorošenko V. Piezīmes (Rīgā 1961. – 1984) // Latvijas Arhīvi, 2002, no 2, 115. – 124. lpp.
- Dorošenko V. Oчерki agrarnoi istorii Latvii v XVI veke. Riga, 1960, 325 s.
- Dorošenko, V. Myzno-barshchinnoe hoziaistvo v iuzhnoi (latyshskoi) chasti Lifiandii v XVI veke // Srednie veka, 1962, no 21, S. 122–140; no 22, S. 100–115.
- Dorošenko V. Myza i ryнок. Hoziaistvo Rizhskoi iezuitskoj kollegii na rubezhe XVI i XVII vekov. Riga: Zinātne, 1973. 187 s.
- Dubrovskii A. Istorik i vlast': istoricheskaia nauka v SSSR i kontseptsia istorii feodal'noi Rossii v kontekste politiki i ideologii (1930–1950-e gg.). Briansk: Izdatel'stvo Brianskogo gosudarstvennogo univetsiteta im. akad. I.G. Petrovskogo, 2005. 800 s.
- Engelhardt H. Beitrag zur Entstehung der Gutsherrschaft in Livland während der Ordenszeit. Leipzig – Riga, 1897.

- Galiamichev A. *Medievistika v Saratovskom universitete (stranitsy istorii)* // *Srednevekovyi gorod 15. Saratov: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo universiteta, 2002. S. 3–12.*
- Galiamichev A. *Medievisty peterburgskoi (leningradskoi) shkoly v Saratovskom universitete // Dialog so vremenem. Al'manah intellektual'noi istorii, Vyp. 10. Moskva: IVI RAN, 2003. S. 289–299.*
- Galiamichev A. *Medievistika v Saratovskom universitete: ocherki istorii (1917–1977). Saratov: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo universiteta, 2010. 116 s.*
- Gorfunkel' A. *Zametki o vospominaniiah A.Ia. Gurevicha istoriia istorika* // Gorfunkel' A. *Trud nauki i izvoroity sharlatanstva. O remesle istorika. Sankt-Peterburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2013. S. 410–414.*
- Gurevich A. *Istoriik sredi ruin: Popytka kriticheskogo prochteniia memuarov E.V. Gutnovoi // Srednie veka, 2002, Vyp. 63, S. 362–393.*
- Gurevich A. *Istoriia istorika. Moskva: ROSSPEN, 2004.*
- Gurevich A. *Grehopadenie moskovskih medievistov: diskussiiia 1949 goda i eio posledstviia // Odissei. Chelovek v istorii. Istoriia kak igra metafor: metafory istorii, obshchestva i politiki. Moskva: Nauka, 2007. S. 341–349.*
- Gurevich A.Ia. *Aprii sovremennoi istoricheskoi nauki – mnimye i podlinnye // Odissei 1997. Chelovek v istorii. Kul'turnaia istoriia sotsial'nogo. Moskva: Nauka, 1997. S. 233–250.*
- Gutnova E. *Piat' desiat let sovetckoi medievistiki // Srednie veka, 1967, no 30, S. 3–40.*
- Gutnova E. *Perezhitoe. Moskva: ROSSPEN, 2001.*
- Haritonovich D. *Sovremennost' Srednevekov'ia // Novyi mir, 2000, no 10.*
- Hellmann M. *Das Lettenland im Mittelalter. Münster – Köln, 1954.*
- The Invention of Tradition* / eds. E. Hobsbawm, T. Ranger. Cambridge: University Press, 1983.
- Iurganov A. *Russkoe natsional'noe gosudarstvo. Zhiznennyi mir istorikov epohi stalinizma. Moskva: RGGU, 2011.*
- Ivanovs A. *Latvijas PSR historiogrāfija: (konceptuāls pārskats) // Latvijas Vēsture, 2003, No 2, 75. – 83. lpp.; No 3, 69. – 77. lpp.*
- Ivanovs A. *Sovietization of Latvian Historiography 1944–1959: Overview // The hidden and forbidden history of Latvia under Soviet and Nazi occupations 1940–1991. Riga: Institute of the History of Latvia, 2005. P. 256–270.*
- Ivanovs A. *Padomju politika Latvijā 20. gadsimta 50. gadu otrajā pusē – 80. gadu vidū: izpētēs gaita, rezultāti un turpmākā perspektīva (historiogrāfisks apskats) // Latvijas vēsture 20. gadsimta 40.– 90. gados. Latvijas Vēsturnieku komisijas 2006. gada pētījumi. Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2007. 305. – 355. lpp.*
- Jakubowski J., Kordzikowski J. *Polska w XVI wieku. Inflanty. Warszawa, 1915.*
- Johansen P. *Siedlung und Agrarwesen der Esten im Mittelalter // Deutsche Siedlungsforschungen. Festschrift für Kötzschke. Leipzig und Berlin. 1927.*
- Koposov N. *Kak dumaiut istoriki. Moskva: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2001.*
- Koposov N. *Istorigheskie poniatiiia v mire bez budushchego // Kak my pishem istoriiu / red. G. Dufaud, G. Garreta, V. Pimenova. Moskva: Rosspen, 2013. S. 57–93.*
- Kozlov S. *“Opredelionnyi sposob zanimat'sia naukoj”: Karlo Ginzburg i traditsiia // Ginzburg K. Mify – emblemy – primety: morfologiia i istoriia. Moskva: Novoe izd-vo, 2004. S. 321–345.*
- Lebedeva G., Iakubskii V. *Cathedra Medii Aevi: materialy k istorii leningradckoi medievistiki 1930–1950-h godov. Sankt-Peterburg: Izd-vo S.-Peterburgskogo universiteta, 2007. 125 s.*
- Maitland F. *Domesday book and beyond: three essays in the early history of England. Cambridge: University Press, 1907.*
- Makarov A. *Obraz Drugogo kak obraz pamiatii (Metodologicheskie aspekty problemy reprezentatsii proshlogo) // Dialog so vremenem, 2007, no 18, S. 6–18.*
- Mil'skaia L. *Vospominaniia E.V. Gutnovoi i ih dostovernost' // Srednie veka, 2002, Vyp. 63, S. 394–401.*
- Niitemaa V. *Der Binnenhandel in der Politik der livländischen Städte im Mittelalter. Helsinki, 1952.*
- Repina L. *Obrazy proshlogo v pamiatii i v istorii // Obrazy proshlogo i kolektivnaia identichnost' v Evrope do nachala novogo vremeni / sost. L. Repina. Moskva: Krug, 2003. S. 9–18.*

- Repina L. Idei – konceptsi – liudi, ili kak pisat' istoriiu medievistiki segodnia? (K 100-letiiu E.V. Gutnovoi) // *Srednie veka*, 2014, No 75 (3–4). S. 406–422.
- Rubene M. Laiks autobiogrāfiskajā rakstībā: Virdžīnija Vulfa, Simona de Bovuāra un Anna Brigadere // *Latvijas Universitātes raksti*. 2014. 804. sēj. Filosofija. Cilvēks un patība – aktualitātes un perspektīvas, 63. – 73. lpp.
- Ryzhakova S. Latyshskaia natsional'naia istoriia: o kul'turnykh mehanizmah v konstruirovanii i referirovanii proshlogo // *Antropologicheskii forum*, 2009, no 11, S. 216–274.
- Ryzhkovskii V. Sovetskaia medievistika and Beyond (k istorii odnoi diskussii) // *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 2009, no 97
- Schwabe A. Grundriss der Agrargeschichte Lettlands. Rīga, 1928.
- Smirnov I. Sotsrealizm: antropologicheskoe izmerenie // *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon* / red. H. Günter, E. Dobrenko. Sankt-Peterburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2000. S. 16–30.
- Soom A. Gutswirtschaft in Livland am Ausgang des XVI Jahrhunderts // *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung*, 1956. Bd. 5. Marburg, S. 34–57.
- Sovetskaia medievistika i eio zadachi v oblasti istoriografii // *Srednie veka*, 1960, 15, ss. 52–55.
- Spekke A. Baltu tautas kristīgās ēras pirmajā gadu tūkstoši // *Tautas Vēsturei*. Rīga: A. Gulbis, 1938. 61. –76. lpp.
- Spekke A. Latvijas vēsture. Latvju tautas likteņcīņas Eiropas krustceļos. Stokholma, 1948.
- Spekke A. History of Latvia: An Outline. Stockholm: Daugava, 1957.
- Stakelberg F. Der Landbesitz im Kreise Pernau zur Ordenszeit // *Sitzungsberichte der Altertumsforschenden zu Pernau*, 1928, Bd. VIII, S. 143 – 205.
- Stam S. Moia zhizn', uchitelia i nauka. Saratov: Izd-vo Saratovskogo universiteta, 2009. 358 s.
- Stenogramma ob'edinennogo zasedaniia sektora istorii Srednih vekov Instituta istorii AN SSSR i Kafedry istorii Srednih vekov Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta 23 marta 1949 goda // *Odissei. Chelovek v istorii. Istoriia kak igra metafor: metafory istorii, obshchestva i politiki*. Moskva: Nauka, 2007. S. 253 – 340.
- Strods H. Latvijas soveticācija (1944. – 1959.) // *Totalitārie režīmi Baltijā: izpētes rezultāti un problēmas*. Starptautiskās konferences materiāli, 2004. gada 3. – 4. jūnijs, Rīga. Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2005. 173. – 192. lpp.
- Švābe A. Latvijas vēsture. Rīga: Avots, 1925 [1990].
- Švābe A. Latvju kultūras vēsture. 1. – 2. sej. Rīga: A. Gulbis, 1921, 1922.
- Švābe A. Pagasta vēsture. Rīga, 1926.
- Švābe A. Zemes attiecību un zemes reformu vēsture Latvijā. Rīga, 1930.
- Švābe A. Priekšvārds // *Vidzemes saimniecības vēstures avoti 1553. – 1618. g.* Rīga, 1941. V – XXVIII. lpp.
- Svanidze A. Srednevekovyi gorod i rynek v Shvetsii XIII–XV vekov. Moskva: Nauka, 1980.
- Svanidze A. Neskol'ko slov ob istoricheskoi pamiatii v sviazii s avtobiografiei istorika // *Srednie veka*, 2002, Vyp. 63, S. 359–361.
- Svanidze A. Grani Srednevekov'ia. Kaleidoskop. Moskva: Novyi khronograf, 20013. S. 391–414.
- Sveshnikov A. Sovetskaia medievistika v ideologicheskoi bor'be 1930–1940-h godov // *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*. 2008. no 90.
- Transche-Roseneck A. Die Entstehung der Schollenpflichtigkeit in Livland // *Mitteilungen aus der livländischen Geschichte*, 1926, Bd. 23, S. 485–574.
- Usmanova D. Sozdavaia natsional'nuu istoriiu tatar: istoriograficheskie i intellektual'nye debaty na rubezhe vekov // *Ab imperio*, 2003, no 3.
- Uvarov P. Portret medievista na fone korporatsii // *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 2006, no 81, S. 194–208.
- Uvarov P. Svoboda u istorikov poka est'. Vo vsiakom sluchae – est' ot chego bezhat' // *Neprikosnovennyi zapas*, 2007, no 55.
- Vasil'ev A. Sovremennye memory studies i transformatsiia klassicheskogo naslediia // *Dialogi so vremenem: pamiat' o proshlom v kontekste istorii* / sost. L. Repina. Moskva: Krug, 2008. S. 19–49.
- Vasilijs V. Dorošenko (25.01.1921.-24.03.1992.) // *Latvijas Vēstures Institūta žurnāls*, 1992, no 2, 206. – 207. lpp.

- Vol'f'sun L. Lev Semionovich Gordon: sud'ba istorika // Odissei 1998. Chelovek v istorii. Lichnost' i obshchestvo: problem samoidentifikatsii. Moskva: Nauka, 1999. S. 204–222.
- Wipper R. Die Zeit der Leibeigenschaft // Die Letten. Aufsätze über Geschichte, Sprache und Kultur der alten Letten. Riga, 1930. S. 164–191.
- Zutis J. Vidzeme kā poļu un zviedru cīņas objects. Rīga, 1949.

Кирчанов Максим Валерьевич, доктор исторических наук, доцент Воронежского государственного университета; maksymkyrchanoff@gmail.com

**Интеллектуальная археология средневекизма
идентичность и историческая память
в латвийской средневековедении советского периода
(случай Василия Дорошенко)**

The author analyzes the problems of intellectual archeology of Vasilii Doroshenko's texts. Vasily Doroshenko, the Soviet medievalist, began his academic career in Moscow University. Political dynamics of Soviet society in the second half of the 1940s forced him to participate in an anti-Semitic campaign and criticize Aleksandr Iosifovich Neusykhin who was his supervisor. A few years later Vasilii Doroshenko emigrated to Latvian SSR because he was not able to integrate into the community of Moscow medievalists. Doroshenko's career in Latvia was formally successful, and he became one of the leading Latvian medievalists. The author analyzes the problems of intellectual and cultural archeology of Vasilii Doroshenko's texts, published in Latvia. The culture of citation was a unique phenomenon in the Soviet historiography. The author tries to analyze why Vasilii Doroshenko cites some and ignored other Soviet historians. The author presumes that culture of citations in contexts of intellectual archaeology can be perceived as a form of symbolic communication and the exchange of gifts between the Soviet medievalists. The culture of citation can also be perceived as the invented tradition.

Keywords: the history of medieval studies, Vasilii Doroshenko, Latvian historiography, intellectual archaeology, citations, exchange of gifts

Maksym Kyrchanoff, Dr. Sc. (History), Associate Professor, Voronezh State University; maksymkyrchanoff@gmail.com